RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 1 1 2008

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING FAXED AND DEPOSITED ON 1/31/07 WITH THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE AS FIRST CLASS MAIL IN AN ENVELOPE ADDRESSED TO: THE COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313-1460.

(TYPED NAME OF PERSON MAILING PAPER OR FEE)

11/9/07
SIGNATURE OF PERSON MAILING PAPER OR FEE) D

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In the Application of:

William F. Reeves

for: COMPUTER INSTUMENTS & EMERGENCY
 MONITORING DEVICES FOR RETRIEVING
 & DISPLAYING STORED MEDICAL
 RECORDS FROM BODILY WORN
 DEVICES

Serial No.: 09/583,336

Filed on: May 31,2000

Hamden, Connecticut, November 9, 2007

Mail Stop AF Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

SIR:

Applicant hereby responds to the Office Action dated 8/13/07. The Applicant notes several informal telecoms with Examiner Gilligan regarding the office action, word changes suggestions, claims modification suggestions, and the allowance of the inventors other related patents that were previously "incorporated by reference."

35 USC 112 Objections

The Applicant notes the 35 USC 112 objections in the office action. Accordingly the applicant has made the necessary word changes to independent claims 58 and 68, and dependent claim 66 to address these objections.

35 USC 103 Objections

The applicant has made word changes and added new elements regarding porting and docking to independent claims 58 and 68 so as to more distinctly define this art from the art of Yeager 97/22297, Davis 4, 941, 201, and Linder 6,681,003 as noted in the Office Action. Specifically, the applicant has added the element "means of simultaneously transmitting data and power to said storage device during said docking or porting via either contact or non contact capacitance or inductance elements." The applicant points out that this art is taught in Reeves 6,747, 561 (application 09/597,107) which has been incorporated into this application by reference. This new element more distinctly points out the unique and novel art in the application and clearly distinguishes it from the prior art of Yeager, Davis and Linder cited by the Examiner.

The Applicant has also made several grammatical changes in the wording several claims.